

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1-32 are pending in the above-identified application.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-11, 13-20, 22-26, 28-29 and 31-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minton U.S. patent No. 6,014,643 (hereinafter "Minton") in view of Robertson et al. European patent application No. 0 665 489 A2 (hereinafter "Robertson"). The Examiner rejected claims 3 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minton and Robertson and in further view of Hawkins et al. U.S. patent No. 6,247,000 (hereinafter "Hawkins"). The Examiner rejected claims 9, 12, 27 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minton and Robertson and in further view of Harrington et al. U.S. patent No. 6,161,099 (hereinafter "Harrington"). Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 19 to more clearly define the claimed invention. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

II. Applicants' Response to the Claim Rejections

A. Summary of independent claims 1 and 19

Applicants' independent claims 1 and 19 are directed to systems and methods for submitting trade commands in an electronic trading system.

More particularly, amended claims 1 and 19 specify receiving a submission of a bid, offer, buy, or sell command from a trader via a first interface - e.g., an entry interface. In response to this submission, a second interface - e.g., a trading interface - is displayed for confirming the command entered by the trader. The command is submitted in response to the trader confirming the submission via the second interface. The second interface is displayed in response to any bid, offer, buy, or sell command. In other words, the same second interface is displayed regardless of the type of command or order that is submitted via the first interface. For example, the interface that is displayed in response to a trader submitting a sell command is the same as the one that is displayed in response to the trader submitting a bid, offer, or buy command. Although the second interface does not depend on the submitted command, the information

populating the fields in that interface may depend on it. For example, the second interface may include price and/or size fields that are populated with the price and/or size submitted via the first interface.

B. The 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

i. The rejection of claims

1-2, 4-8, 10-11, 13-20, 22-26, 28-29 and 31-32

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-11, 13-20, 22-26, 28-29 and 31-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minton in view of Robertson. The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner maintains that Minton and Robertson, taken together, disclose all the features of applicants' independent claims 1 and 19. However, applicants respectfully submit that neither Minton nor Robertson shows or suggests all the features of claims 1 and 19, as amended.

Minton relates to a data processing system that allows an individual to enter an offer to buy or sell a security using a first screen (trading screen 400), select a particular security through a second screen (pricing screen 500) and either confirm an order to buy the security

through a third screen (buy screen 600) or confirm an order to sell the security through a fourth screen (sell screen 700).

Robertson merely relates to a system that automatically repositions a cursor at a determined location on a computer display when, for example, a new window is opened in response to a command being entered.

Applicants submit that neither Minton nor Robertson shows or suggests all the features of each of claims 1 and 19. More specifically, applicants submit that neither Minton nor Robertson shows or suggests presenting an interface in response to a submission of a bid, offer, buy, or sell command, where the interface is displayed in response to any bid, offer, buy, or sell command.

The Examiner contends that applicants failed to recognize that screen 400 invokes screen 600/700 in Minton. Applicants do not dispute that Minton discloses displaying a screen for confirming an order relating to a security in response to a selection made through another screen. However, applicants submit that the confirmation screen that is displayed depends on the order. Applicants maintain that two separate and distinct confirmation screens are disclosed in

Minton: 1) buy screen 600 for confirming an order to buy a security, and 2) sell screen 700 for confirming an order to sell a security. Each one of screens 600 and 700 relates to only one of buying or selling a security. (Minton, col. 10, line 54 through col. 12, line 42) This is in stark contrast to an interface that is displayed in response to any bid, offer, buy, or sell command, as specified in claims 1 and 19. That is because, unlike the different screens disclosed in Minton, applicants' claimed invention specifies presenting the same second interface regardless of the type of command that is submitted via the first interface.

For example, the interface that is displayed in response to a trader submitting a sell command is the same as the one that is displayed in response to the trader submitting a buy command according to applicants' claimed invention. Minton, on the other hand, refers to displaying buy screen 600 (which is not the same as sell screen 700) for confirming an order to buy a security. Therefore, unlike applicants' claimed invention, the interface that is displayed in response to a trader submitting a sell command is not the same as the

one that is displayed in response to the trader submitting a buy command according to Minton.

Accordingly, Minton does not show or suggest applicants' improvement of allowing for the confirmation of a submission of a particular bid, offer, buy, or sell command via the same interface that is presented in response to the submission of any bid, offer, buy, or sell command. Robertson is limited to controlling the position of a cursor on a computer display and also does not show or suggest applicants' aforementioned improvement.

Because neither Minton nor Robertson, taken together or separately, shows or suggests all the features of each of amended independent claims 1 and 19, applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 19 are allowable over Minton and Robertson. Because claims 2-8, 10-11 and 13-18 depend from claim 1, and claims 20-26, 28-29 and 31-32 depend from claim 19, applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also allowable over Minton and Robertson for at least the same reasons as the independent claims. Applicants therefore request that the rejection of claims 1-8, 10-11, 13-26, 28-29 and 31-32 be withdrawn.

ii. The rejections of claims
claims 3, 9, 12, 21, 27 and 30

The Examiner rejected claims 3 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minton and Robertson and in further view of Hawkins. The Examiner rejected claims 9, 12, 27 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minton and Robertson and in further view of Harrington. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have demonstrated that claims 1 and 19 are allowable over Minton and Robertson. Because claims 3, 9 and 12 depend from allowable claim 1, and claims 21, 27 and 30 depend from allowable claim 19, applicants respectfully submit that claims 3, 9, 12, 21, 27 and 30 are allowable. Applicants therefore request that the rejections of claims 3, 9, 12, 21, 27 and 30 be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 09/745,651
Reply dated May 16, 2005
Reply to final Office Action of December 15, 2004

III. Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance. Entry of the amendments and a favorable action are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hassan Albakri
(Limited Recognition)
Agent for Applicants
Fish & Neave IP Group
Ropes & Gray LLP
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1105
Tel.: (212) 596-9000